a person of "outstanding reputation and scholarly ability." I do not possess, nor have I ever sought, either. She is as wrong about me as she alleges I am about JPH. Most of what I have discovered I have published in the hope that it would be of some help in my own generation. And that, I learned by example from my teacher, Kroeber, a thought which supports me in my senectitude.

University of California, Berkeley

"The Development Of Pinyon Exploitation In Central Eastern California"

KELLY R. McGUIRE
ALAN P. GARFINKEL

Robert Bettinger's (1976) article in the preceding issue of this journal represents one of several recent sophisticated treatments of surface distributional data in the Great Basin (see also Thomas 1971; O'Connell 1971). The results of such work have opened up a whole new dimension of patterning in the archaeological record. However, sophisticated methodology in itself is no substitute for rigorous application of scientific method.

Bettinger attempts to demonstrate that pinyon nut exploitation began in the Owens Valley at approximately A.D. 600. This he has failed to do. Instead Bettinger's argument only demonstrates the introduction of a stone-ring feature associated with the exploitation of pinyon—not necessarily the exploitation of pinyon itself.

Bettinger classifies 21 sites as "pinyon camps." The criteria used to define this functional site type consist of three primary characteristics: (1) location of a site in the pinyon-juniper zone; (2) presence of milling equipment; and (3) presence of circular floors. The presence of these attributes at a site "suggests that pinyon collecting and processing was the most important activity at these sites" (Bettinger 1976:86). These "pinyon camps" were dated using time-marker projectile points found on the surface of these sites. All but one of the sites date from a period of time ranging between A.D. 600 to A.D. 1850. From this Bettinger declares that pinyon exploitation commenced at approximately A.D. 600 and prior to this pinyon exploitation was negligible or nonexistent.

We wish to address the contention that the physical remains described by Bettinger are the only possible manifestations of pinyon exploitation. If such is the case, one would expect to find similar manifestations in other areas of the Great Basin. Fortunately, a similar surface survey has been accomplished. Thomas's (1971) study of the Reese River Valley employs an almost identical sampling design based on 500-meter random transect tracts which cut biotic communities.

Thomas (1971:47) indicates that "actual harvesting of pinyon nuts leaves only perishable artifacts . . .; the physical remains population resulting from the pinyon harvest is nil. Ancillary activities, such as food preparation took place in the winter village, not in the pinyon grove." Archaeological data from the pinyon-juniper zone in the Reese River Valley support Thomas' hypothesis since there is an extreme paucity of both stone circles and milling equipment as indicated in Table I.
TABLE 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PINYON-JUNIPER ZONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of 500 m tracts</th>
<th>Typable Projectile Points</th>
<th>Stone Circles</th>
<th>Metates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owens Valley</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese River Valley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the ethnographically documented heavy exploitation of pinyon in the Reese River Valley (Steward 1938:104), it is readily apparent from the above data that stone circles and milling equipment are not necessarily a prerequisite for pinyon exploitation.

Thus, Bettinger’s argument more properly demonstrates the initiation of a feature(s) (i.e., circular floors) associated with pinyon exploitation ca. A.D. 600, but does not nullify the alternative proposition that pinyon could have been exploited previously in a different fashion with correspondingly different material remains resulting. Such an alternative set of conditions existed in the Reese River Valley, and thus there is no reason to discount the possibility of their occurrence in the Owens Valley prior to A.D. 600.

However, if we accept the condition that pinyon exploitation may leave little in the way of physical remains, how then does one explain the appearance of Bettinger’s “pinyon camps” at A.D. 600? We suggest that the following events occurred. The population pressure which Bettinger claims existed at this time, may have caused increasing exploitation of pinyon resources over a longer yearly time period. Prior to A.D. 600 pinyon may have been exploited only during those few weeks when nuts could be easily knocked out of their cones and transported to the winter encampments. With increasing population pressure, which would necessitate lengthier, more intensive periods of pinyon exploitation, a whole new regimen of pinyon harvesting, including the roasting of green cones and the prolonged habitation of sites in the pinyon-juniper zone may have been initiated. This would explain the abrupt rise in Bettinger’s diagnostic “pinyon camp” attributes. However, this model in no way rules out pinyon exploitation prior to A.D. 600. Given the overriding ethnographic importance of pinyon nuts as a food source within the Great Basin, we feel that a full range of additional explanations must be examined before the acceptance of a date of A.D. 600 for the inception of pinyon exploitation in the Owens River Valley.

University of California, Davis
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Announcement on Use of Harrington Papers

JAMES R. GLENN
Archivist

The Smithsonian Institution National Anthropological Archives has recently been awarded a grant of $25,000 by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for a one-year project to arrange, describe, and publish on microfilm the California material among the papers of John P. Harrington. Harrington, a linguist and ethnologist with the Bureau of American Ethnology between 1915 and 1945, amassed a trove of ethnological, linguistic, and historical data on the Indians of California. Its publication should facilitate the work of many researchers throughout the country. An incidental benefit will be preservation of the material on archival quality microfilm to assure its availability to generations of future scholars. Dr. Herman J. Viola, Director of the Archives, will have overall charge of the project, and Dr. Ives Goddard, of the Smithsonian's Department of Anthropology, will be its chief linguist. In addition, a number of experts in various disciplines will be called upon for advice. The project will begin in early December.

Although the Archives hopes to continue to make the material available to researchers, certain portions will of necessity be unavailable for brief periods of time as arrangement and microfilming proceed. Researchers are urged, therefore, to make arrangements for use of the papers well in advance of visits. Past researchers have been remarkably generous with information useful in processing the Harrington papers and have been patient and cooperative in following archivists' admonitions in handling the documents. In order to allow the production of the most usable microfilm possible, such generosity and cooperation are needed now more than ever.
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